REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 4, 7 and 11 being the independent Claims. It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 4-13 have been allowed, and Claims 2-3 have been objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Please amend Claim 1 as set forth herein. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0054807 to *Hsu et al.* (hereinafter *Hsu*).

Regarding the §102(a) rejection, the Examiner alleged that *Hsu* teaches each and every element of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 recites *inter alia*, receiving, from a new BS, a new BCMCS zone ID that is different from a prestored old BCMCS zone ID, while receiving the BCMCS data from an old BS. The Examiner maintained the allegation that *Hsu* reads on this recitation, but Applicants cannot find this teaching anywhere in the numerous paragraphs (i.e., [0088] – [0095]) cited by the Examiner.

Specifically, *Hsu* teaches in regard to the cited paragraphs (particularly par. [0090]), that the MS on the BCMCS monitors the serving sector for a set of three id values. When the serving sector, (which may be considered an old BS) is no longer the best sector, the MS switches to a new sector (which may be considered a new BS), where the MS monitors the same BCMCS but one of the three id values (i.e. mac_id) may be different. As such, although *Hsu* may broadly teach receiving a new and different zone id (i.e. the mac_id), *Hsu* clearly does not teach that the

new id is received while receiving the BCMCS data from an old BS, as claimed, because the MS switches to a new sector. It is respectfully asserted that the MS in *Hsu* is no longer receiving data from the old BS.

In order for the §102(a) rejection to stand, *Hsu* would have to either expressly or implicitly teach the recitations in the rejected claim. As to at least the recitation at issue, it is respectfully asserted that *Hsu* fails to do so.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to include a "wherein" clause, in view of Table1 and the related description on page 7 which disclose that the BCMCS_ZONE_ID field has 8 bits when the BCMCS_SUPPORT field is set to "1". It is respectfully submitted that *Hsu* fails to teach each and every element of Claim 1, contrary to the rejection. Accordingly, the §102(a) rejection is incorrect and should be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-3, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on independent Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to dependent Claims 2-3 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-13, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd. Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/RCC/dr